

THE DAILY RECORD UNION.

TUESDAY, JANUARY 22, 1884

THIS MORNING'S NEWS.

In New York Government bonds are quoted at 120 for 4s of 1897, 114 for 4s, 101 for 5s; silver, \$4 20c; gold, \$100; 100 for 1s; silver bars, \$35.

Silver in London, 604d; consols, 101 11/16d; 5 per cent. United States bonds, extended, 105; 4s, 127; 4s, 117.

In San Francisco Mexican dollars are quoted at 85cents cents.

Mining stocks opened moderately active in San Francisco yesterday. The Bodie assessment of 50 cents per share went on, and the stock opened at \$15 25, but closed at \$15 10. The stock of the \$25 50. Morris was carried along with Bodie at \$25 50, advancing to \$25 75, and closing at \$25 45. There was considerable business in Navajo at better prices, say \$25 to \$30. The Comstock were generally well sustained, though showing no particular advance.

In Fresno county, Philip Jones shot and wounded William and John Blunt—the former mortally.

Mr. Ludlow walked for a wager of \$3,000 from Los Angeles to Tomolata, A. T., and won it.

In a road near the river near Macon, Mo., yesterday, a stage and two coaches were wrecked and six passengers badly hurt.

Two friends arrived in New York City yesterday.

Thalia's Music Hall, in London, was destroyed by fire Sunday night.

The Cray and Crayton appeared in public at St. Petersburg Sunday night.

Montauk wants her boundary extended to Hudson's Bay.

Black recruits for the Egyptian army have to be driven to the front.

Tammany men have been chosen President and Clerk of the New York Board of Aldermen.

A testimonial subscription is proposed in Boston to be presented to Lieutenant Rhodes, the hero of the recent marine disaster.

The Canadas: Pacific: Railroad has asked the Dominion Government for \$14,000,000 additional assistance.

Several buildings were demolished in Malone, N. Y., yesterday by a gas explosion.

There were no further negotiations with China until all her objects in Tonquin are achieved.

A meeting of Nationalists was held Sunday in the yard of the Catholic chapel, Dublin.

A short strike in San Jose yesterday from the effects of a fall from a ladder.

The stage from Wickettengen for Prescott was rolled near the latter place Sunday evening.

Gus Miller, a well-known German of Portland, Or., was found dead in bed at that place yesterday morning.

The two kidnappers robbed a stage near Grant's Pass, Or., yesterday, taking the express box, but not disturbing the mail and passengers.

By the loss of a fishing schooner of the Massachusetts coast, four men were drowned.

First meeting of the American Exchange Hotel in Antioch yesterday morning, two men—John Griffin and Thomas Haynes—parishing in the flames.

Five walls walls, W. T.

The stage from Wickettengen was drawn Sunday in the Chehalis river, W. T.

It is expected at Portland that ice will close the upper Columbia river within the next thirty hours.

Two men were drowned Sunday night at Langley, B. C.

A Chinaman was murdered in the street at Victoria, B. C., Sunday night.

Five members of the Salvation Army were arrested yesterday in Bridgeport, Conn., for parading the streets.

The Chinaman bodies recovered from the City of Columbus disaster are to be taken to Boston and deposited in the morgue.

It is now said that the woman (run at Ouray, Colo., last week, was soon to become a mother.

In a fight between two gamblers at Gunnison, Colo., one was instantly killed and the other mortally wounded.

In the trial of James Nutt at Pittsburgh, the case went to the jury last evening.

A BUDWEISER EXHIBITION.

To-night an exhibition by a party of bruisers, or so-called pugilists, is to be given in this city. It ought not to be, but it is probable that there is no law to prevent it, where there should be. These pugilistic exhibitions are denouncing, contribute nothing to the public good, do not augment the sum of human happiness, and are representative of the brutal element, which will be present in force to-night as it floats to the surface on all such occasions. It is said in defense of these disgusting shows, one or more of which we have witnessed sufficiently to analyze them, that they are not harmful because no actual personal violence is accomplished, soft gloves being used. There is more pretense, for the men who exhibit themselves do so as bruisers, and the curiosity to see them is aroused by the announcement that they have bruised, battered, maimed and wounded their fellow-men in the prize ring. They cannot lay any claim to the chivalry; the skill they represent is not that which is used for men's good, to defend the right or repress wrong. On the contrary it is more likely to be acquired by the evil-doer, more likely to be used by the rowdy, the ruffian, and the cut-throat. It is no defense of these exhibitions whatever that the art of self-defense is a manly art. It is manly; it is an accomplishment to be able to "take care of one's self," to know how to guard one's body from the blows of an adversary; but such exhibitions as these do not teach the art of self-defense. The spectator may witness two bruisers pound each other for hours and not be a whit wiser as to how best to use his own arms in defending his body, or how best to make an assault when the necessity arises for it. Pugilism is the art of self-defense and the cut-throat. It is no defense of these exhibitions whatever that the art of self-defense is a manly art. It is manly; it is an accomplishment to be able to "take care of one's self," to know how to guard one's body from the blows of an adversary; but such exhibitions as these do not teach the art of self-defense. The spectator may witness two bruisers pound each other for hours and not be a whit wiser as to how best to use his own arms in defending his body, or how best to make an assault when the necessity arises for it.

Pugilism is the art of self-defense and the cut-throat.

The Pacer Herald asks: "If Sacramento should begin to retrograde, and building should stop entirely, would the RECORD UNION advise all the carpenters of that city to at once possess themselves of land and go to farming?" It did so, however, follow its advice? We certainly should, and deem it most excellent advice. The one thing every man should do who can do it, is to possess something of God's tool—subdue it and make it yield to his tilling. As to the acceptance of advice, that is another thing. The Herald adds: "If, instead of houses, there were still bridges or fences to build, that being in the carpenter's line, he would, no doubt, stay and build them, otherwise he would graduate to some locality where his particular services were in demand." Precisely. Our contemporary can no issue upon us as to that. So we say, if hydraulic mines can be worked by some unobjectionable process, they should be so minded. If they cannot, the next best thing to do is to make all due efforts to force the soil to yield a living to its occupants. If this is not possible, then of course the example of the carpenters our contemporary cites must be followed—we have no idea that the miners propose to stably, mounr the past and starve. Our contemporary continues: "The soil on the western slope of the Sierras, at an altitude corresponding with the location of most of the hydraulic mines, is tolerably fertile, and very well adapted to the production of potatoes, vegetables and the earlier fruits, such as apples, pears and cherries. A few of the present population, more particularly those who have, at some time in their lives, had experience in this kind of industry, may resort to cultivation of the soil for a living; but to expect every miner to do so, regardless of experience and regardless of inclination, is not reasonable." We have no such expectation. It has not been the question of "What shall the miners do?" so much as "What development of the mining region is possible?" The hardship visited upon the miners no one realizes more fully than we, and no one extends them more sincere sympathy; but it will not buy them the necessities of life or give them a competency.

The Herald also says: "We have entertained the belief and the hope that some time in the future these Sierra slopes, to an altitude of from 3,000 to 4,000 feet, will be covered with orchards and gardens, varying in the character of the product according to the altitude, and dotted with neat and comfortable and attractive homes. But to expect men who have followed mining all their lives, and who have in most instances grown old in the service, to work out this change would be expecting too much." This is probably true; but what will the Herald propose? If it requires a new population and a long time to develop the possibilities of the mountain section, let us all bend our energies to inducing the immigration of the one and the other to the Sierra slopes.

Washington Territory.

The Cour d'Alene Excitement.

Spokane Falls, January 21st.—The Cour

prize fight, to which they pave the way for the unprofessional looker-on.

THE EIGHT TO TRADE FREELY.

"There is no certainty," say the dispatches, "that the Mexican reciprocity treaty has been finally defeated. An extension of time has been secured, and we have until July 20th in which to debate the matter." It is added that there was but one vote lacking to confirm the convention, the opponents of the treaty mustering just one more than one-third of the Senate. The free traders of the South defeated the measure, and thus contradicted their own doctrines and stultified their position as to the tariff. Pure self-interest worked the defeat. Thus it is stated by the correspondents that "Louisiana wants free trade for everything but sugar, North Carolina on everything but sugar, Virginia and a few other States on everything but tobacco, Ohio on everything but wool, and the States further west on everything but hoggs, concerning which they are just now crying for retaliating measures against France and Germany for excluding their products. The high protectionists in the Senate voted against the treaty because it tends toward free trade, and the free traders because it was aimed at raw material produced in their special localities." This is a very humiliating showing, for it is equivalent to a statement that the best good of the whole people was not the actuating principle. The extreme protectionists we think, "overshot the mark," in seeking to protect a few by opposing Mexican reciprocity, lay on an export duty, for the treaty proposed is but a means to an end, and that end is to stimulate and encourage our exports. When, therefore, the protectionists declare that reciprocity injures industries, they literally say there shall not be free export, in order that protected industries may tax the people. For, if we secure free export by admitting the country with which we had a convention to a like privilege, we foster the scheme of the Constitution. That instrument forbids the levy of taxes on articles of export, and non-reciprocity in fact compels us to lose on our exports amounting to an export tax. Says Perry, his recent admirable work on political economy: "The Constitution limits the power of Congress to tax the people to the sole purpose of getting the money; by which we are to understand that it is to get money for the whole United States, not lay taxes to enable a few to get money from the many, from the many from the few. So the conclusion is reached logically that a tax on foreign goods which prevents us from getting money by reason of a high rate, raises the price of the domestic product, and being thus a direct act of taxation, is unjust and unconstitutional. Webster, in his celebrated speech against Hayne, it will be remembered, declared that "the authority of Congress to exercise revenue power with direct reference to the protection of manufactures is a questionable authority." With a vast surplus revenue, it is all the more questionable whether a tax can be levied on one class to protect another, because the getting of the money is not for the end contemplated by the scheme of our Government, to wit, the support of the Constitution. The imposition of heavy duties on Mexican imports practically lays an export duty on our trade with that country. What then shall we say to those who oppose reciprocity? Simply that you are levying indirectly upon the people an export tax, since, as we have said, our trade, except through reciprocity, cannot have free export, as contemplated by the Constitution. To the notion of non-reciprocity and the bar to trade the country will not long submit and the present defeat will not be final.

MOUNTAIN POPULATION.

The Pacer Herald asks: "If Sacramento should begin to retrograde, and building should stop entirely, would the RECORD UNION advise all the carpenters of that city to at once possess themselves of land and go to farming?" It did so, however, follow its advice? We certainly should, and deem it most excellent advice. The one thing every man should do who can do it, is to possess something of God's tool—subdue it and make it yield to his tilling. As to the acceptance of advice, that is another thing. The Herald adds: "If, instead of houses, there were still bridges or fences to build, that being in the carpenter's line, he would, no doubt, stay and build them, otherwise he would graduate to some locality where his particular services were in demand." Precisely. Our contemporary can no issue upon us as to that. So we say, if hydraulic mines can be worked by some unobjectionable process, they should be so minded. If they cannot, the next best thing to do is to make all due efforts to force the soil to yield a living to its occupants. If this is not possible, then of course the example of the carpenters our contemporary cites must be followed—we have no idea that the miners propose to stably, mounr the past and starve. Our contemporary continues: "The soil on the western slope of the Sierras, at an altitude corresponding with the location of most of the hydraulic mines, is tolerably fertile, and very well adapted to the production of potatoes, vegetables and the earlier fruits, such as apples, pears and cherries. A few of the present population, more particularly those who have, at some time in their lives, had experience in this kind of industry, may resort to cultivation of the soil for a living; but to expect every miner to do so, regardless of experience and regardless of inclination, is not reasonable." We have no such expectation. It has not been the question of "What shall the miners do?" so much as "What development of the mining region is possible?" The hardship visited upon the miners no one realizes more fully than we, and no one extends them more sincere sympathy; but it will not buy them the necessities of life or give them a competency.

The Herald also says: "We have entertained the belief and the hope that some time in the future these Sierra slopes, to an altitude of from 3,000 to 4,000 feet, will be covered with orchards and gardens, varying in the character of the product according to the altitude, and dotted with neat and comfortable and attractive homes. But to expect men who have followed mining all their lives, and who have in most instances grown old in the service, to work out this change would be expecting too much." This is probably true; but what will the Herald propose? If it requires a new population and a long time to develop the possibilities of the mountain section, let us all bend our energies to inducing the immigration of the one and the other to the Sierra slopes.

Washington Territory.

The Cour d'Alene Excitement.

Spokane Falls, January 21st.—The Cour

prize fight, to which they pave the way for the unprofessional looker-on.

PACIFIC SLOPE.

Shooting Affair in Fresno County—A Woman Pedestrian—Fatal Fall at San Jose—Another Stage Robbery in Arizona—Advice from Oregon—Fire and Loss of Life at Antioch—Etc.

[S E C U R E D I S P A T C H E S T S T O R Y R E C O R D U N I O N.]

California Certificate.

SAN FRANCISCO, January 21st.—Colonel Bee was put on the witness-stand in the United States District Court to-day, to testify regarding the issue of Consular certificates. The Mexican reciprocity treaty has been finally defeated. An extension of time has been secured, and we have until July 20th in which to debate the matter." It is added that there was but one vote lacking to confirm the convention, the opponents of the treaty mustering just one more than one-third of the Senate. The free traders of the South defeated the measure, and thus contradicted their own doctrines and stultified their position as to the tariff. Pure self-interest worked the defeat. Thus it is stated by the correspondents that "Louisiana wants free trade for everything but sugar, North Carolina on everything but sugar, Virginia and a few other States on everything but tobacco, Ohio on everything but wool, and the States further west on everything but hoggs, concerning which they are just now crying for retaliating measures against France and Germany for excluding their products. The high protectionists in the Senate voted against the treaty because it tends toward free trade, and the free traders because it was aimed at raw material produced in their special localities." This is a very humiliating showing, for it is equivalent to a statement that the best good of the whole people was not the actuating principle. The extreme protectionists we think, "overshot the mark," in seeking to protect a few by opposing Mexican reciprocity, lay on an export duty, for the treaty proposed is but a means to an end, and that end is to stimulate and encourage our exports. When, therefore, the protectionists declare that reciprocity injures industries, they literally say there shall not be free export, in order that protected industries may tax the people. For, if we secure free export by admitting the country with which we had a convention to a like privilege, we foster the scheme of the Constitution. That instrument forbids the levy of taxes on articles of export, and non-reciprocity in fact compels us to lose on our exports amounting to an export tax. Says Perry, his recent admirable work on political economy: "The Constitution limits the power of Congress to tax the people to the sole purpose of getting the money; by which we are to understand that it is to get money for the whole United States, not lay taxes to enable a few to get money from the many, from the many from the few. So the conclusion is reached logically that a tax on foreign goods which prevents us from getting money by reason of a high rate, raises the price of the domestic product, and being thus a direct act of taxation, is unjust and unconstitutional. Webster, in his celebrated speech against Hayne, it will be remembered, declared that "the authority of Congress to exercise revenue power with direct reference to the protection of manufactures is a questionable authority." With a vast surplus revenue, it is all the more questionable whether a tax can be levied on one class to protect another, because the getting of the money is not for the end contemplated by the scheme of our Government, to wit, the support of the Constitution. The imposition of heavy duties on Mexican imports practically lays an export duty on our trade with that country. What then shall we say to those who oppose reciprocity? Simply that you are levying indirectly upon the people an export tax, since, as we have said, our trade, except through reciprocity, cannot have free export, as contemplated by the Constitution. To the notion of non-reciprocity and the bar to trade the country will not long submit and the present defeat will not be final.

THE EIGHT TO TRADE FREELY.

"There is no certainty," say the dispatches, "that the Mexican reciprocity treaty has been finally defeated. An extension of time has been secured, and we have until July 20th in which to debate the matter." It is added that there was but one vote lacking to confirm the convention, the opponents of the treaty mustering just one more than one-third of the Senate. The free traders of the South defeated the measure, and thus contradicted their own doctrines and stultified their position as to the tariff. Pure self-interest worked the defeat. Thus it is stated by the correspondents that "Louisiana wants free trade for everything but sugar, North Carolina on everything but sugar, Virginia and a few other States on everything but tobacco, Ohio on everything but wool, and the States further west on everything but hoggs, concerning which they are just now crying for retaliating measures against France and Germany for excluding their products. The high protectionists in the Senate voted against the treaty because it tends toward free trade, and the free traders because it was aimed at raw material produced in their special localities." This is a very humiliating showing, for it is equivalent to a statement that the best good of the whole people was not the actuating principle. The extreme protectionists we think, "overshot the mark," in seeking to protect a few by opposing Mexican reciprocity, lay on an export duty, for the treaty proposed is but a means to an end, and that end is to stimulate and encourage our exports. When, therefore, the protectionists declare that reciprocity injures industries, they literally say there shall not be free export, in order that protected industries may tax the people. For, if we secure free export by admitting the country with which we had a convention to a like privilege, we foster the scheme of the Constitution. That instrument forbids the levy of taxes on articles of export, and non-reciprocity in fact compels us to lose on our exports amounting to an export tax. Says Perry, his recent admirable work on political economy: "The Constitution limits the power of Congress to tax the people to the sole purpose of getting the money; by which we are to understand that it is to get money for the whole United States, not lay taxes to enable a few to get money from the many, from the many from the few. So the conclusion is reached logically that a tax on foreign goods which prevents us from getting money by reason of a high rate, raises the price of the domestic product, and being thus a direct act of taxation, is unjust and unconstitutional. Webster, in his celebrated speech against Hayne, it will be remembered, declared that "the authority of Congress to exercise revenue power with direct reference to the protection of manufactures is a questionable authority." With a vast surplus revenue, it is all the more questionable whether a tax can be levied on one class to protect another, because the getting of the money is not for the end contemplated by the scheme of our Government, to wit, the support of the Constitution. The imposition of heavy duties on Mexican imports practically lays an export duty on our trade with that country. What then shall we say to those who oppose reciprocity? Simply that you are levying indirectly upon the people an export tax, since, as we have said, our trade, except through reciprocity, cannot have free export, as contemplated by the Constitution. To the notion of non-reciprocity and the bar to trade the country will not long submit and the present defeat will not be final.

THE EIGHT TO TRADE FREELY.

"There is no certainty," say the dispatches, "that the Mexican reciprocity treaty has been finally defeated. An extension of time has been secured, and we have until July 20th in which to debate the matter." It is added that there was but one vote lacking to confirm the convention, the opponents of the treaty mustering just one more than one-third of the Senate. The free traders of the South defeated the measure, and thus contradicted their own doctrines and stultified their position as to the tariff. Pure self-interest worked the defeat. Thus it is stated by the correspondents that "Louisiana wants free trade for everything but sugar, North Carolina on everything but sugar, Virginia and a few other States on everything but tobacco, Ohio on everything but wool, and the States further west on everything but hoggs, concerning which they are just now crying for retaliating measures against France and Germany for excluding their products. The high protectionists in the Senate voted against the treaty because it tends toward free trade, and the free traders because it was aimed at raw material produced in their special localities." This is a very humiliating showing, for it is equivalent to a statement that the best good of the whole people was not the actuating principle. The extreme protectionists we think, "overshot the mark," in seeking to protect a few by opposing Mexican reciprocity, lay on an export duty, for the treaty proposed is but a means to an end, and that end is to stimulate and encourage our exports. When, therefore, the protectionists declare that reciprocity injures industries, they literally say there shall not be free export, in order that protected industries may tax the people. For, if we secure free export by admitting the country with which we had a convention to a like privilege, we foster the scheme of the Constitution. That instrument forbids the levy of taxes on articles of export, and non-reciprocity in fact compels us to lose on our exports amounting to an export tax. Says Perry, his recent admirable work on political economy: "The Constitution limits the power of Congress to tax the people to the sole purpose of getting the money; by which we are to understand that it is to get money for the whole United States, not lay taxes to enable a few to get money from the many, from the many from the few. So the conclusion is reached logically that a tax on foreign goods which prevents us from getting money by reason of a high rate, raises the price of the domestic product, and being thus a direct act of taxation, is unjust and unconstitutional. Webster, in his celebrated speech against Hayne, it will be remembered, declared that "the authority of Congress to exercise revenue power with direct reference to the protection of manufactures is a questionable authority." With a vast surplus revenue, it is all the more questionable whether a tax can be levied

